

EXHIBIT 7

March 6, 2011 Email from Murphy to McNeill et al. Re: Shafi v. Braintech and Weidinger

**Sandra R. Blackmer**

---

**From:** J.P. Murphy [JMurphy@berrymoorman.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 06, 2011 4:15 PM  
**To:** Thomas G. McNeill  
**Cc:** geoffrey.greeves@pillsburylaw.com; Widlak, Anne; Koval, Susan; Michelle L. Alamo  
**Subject:** RE: Shafi v Braintech and Weidinger

Tom,

I stand corrected on the description of the differences in the software. You are correct, I only noted the difference in programming language in my reply brief. Nevertheless, I have too many concerns about your proposed "protocol" which are not suitable to working out via a phone conference.

Advenovation is under no obligation to provide a list of buyers of its software. That part of the subpoena was quashed. To the extent your proposed "protocol" is a demand for same, it is rejected.

Advenovation will not be turning over originals or copies of its source code to Dr. Martens. As I explained at the hearing, the source code is proprietary and will be produced in my office. A number of safeguards will also have to be employed so that access, copying, note taking and observation is controlled.

The "preamble" of your "protocol" states that my client and I "have not provided Examiners with further information concerning the source code structure, whether and to what extent there exist different versions of the Software and whether there may exist auxiliary files..." While this may be technically true, the fact is, (and you are aware that) we have not been asked to provide *anything*, let alone source code structure, whether different versions of the Software exist and whether there may be auxiliary files. We are not going to agree to any writing that gives the implication that we had any obligation to deliver such information in the absence of a request. I would add that on Dec 30, 2010, I wrote to Ms. Widlak and reminded her that we had yet to hear anything from Braintech regarding any details of the inspection of the software. No response was given and absolutely nothing was done about this on your end for well over 2 months. If such a preamble is necessary, I would expect that it would provide that Braintech and Weidinger have failed to request any "information concerning the source code structure, whether and to what extent there exist different versions of the Software and whether there may exist auxiliary files..."

I am not sure how Robotic Vision Technologies fits into this or why you have this company turning over anything to Mr. Martens. Please provide me with a copy of a bill of sale or other evidence of title or transfer of title of anything related to Reliabot to Robotic Vision Technologies at your earliest convenience. This will help me understand what role if any Robotic Vision Technologies should or should not have in this matter.

In any event, with all due respect, the proposed "protocol" needs to be scratched. I suggest you start over and draft something in the nature of a protective order which has ample safeguards in place. Since this production was sought by Braintech, it is Braintech's obligation to propose an appropriate first draft. The "protocol" does not even come close and I will not waste my client's resources doing Braintech's work by drafting something from scratch. We stand by our commitment that the software will be produced, but only in a controlled environment with limited access and only pursuant to an agreed protective order which limits access and provides for the custody and disposition of any notes or other derivative material, either after the review is complete or at the end of this case.

We will also need for you to commit to have the expert make a report by a date certain and in the absence of a report, the expert will not testify and will have no further involvement in this case.

Thank you.

JP Murphy  
BERRY MOORMAN  
Detroit Office  
313/496-1200  
313/223-1605 (direct)  
313/496-1300 (fax)  
313/303-6296 (cell)  
[www.berrymoorman.com](http://www.berrymoorman.com)

**From:** Thomas G. McNeill [mailto:TMcNeill@dickinson-wright.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 03, 2011 6:10 PM  
**To:** J.P. Murphy  
**Cc:** geoffrey.greeves@pillsburylaw.com; Widlak, Anne; Koval, Susan; Michelle L. Alamo  
**Subject:** Shafi v Braintech and Weidinger

JP,

We have appended Braintech/Weidinger's proposed protocol for Dr. Martens comparison of the source codes.

In response to your email on this topic, we went back and re-reviewed your papers leading up to the December 17 hearing before Magistrate Judge Morgan. The only additional information disclosed therein concerning Advenovation's source code is that it is written in Microsoft VB.net. We did not see any "description of the differences in the software" or any further description of Advenovation's source code, its structure, modules, any necessary auxiliary files, different functionality, or other information required by Dr. Martens to develop a detailed review protocol. Given the paucity of background information as we proceed with the evaluation, it is necessary to include in the protocol certain caveats about additional information and work that may be required based upon Dr. Martens preliminary review.

At your earliest convenience, please let us know if the protocol is acceptable so that we may adhere to the proposed deadlines for next week and the completion of the preliminary review by March 22. If there are areas of disagreement, please call rather than email so that we may communicate effectively to resolve those.

Thanks very much.

Thomas G. McNeill

DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC  
Detroit | Nashville | Washington D.C. | Toronto | Phoenix | Las Vegas  
Bloomfield Hills | Ann Arbor | Lansing | Grand Rapids

500 Woodward Avenue  
Suite 4000  
Detroit, MI 48226

[tmcneill@dickinsonwright.com](mailto:tmcneill@dickinsonwright.com)  
office: 313.223.3632  
cell: 313.516.2436

The information contained in this e-mail, including any attachments, is confidential, intended only for the named recipient(s), and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete the e-mail and any attachments, destroy any printouts that you may have made and notify us immediately by return e-mail. Thank you.

In accordance with U.S. Treasury regulations, if this message contains advice concerning one or more Federal tax issues, it is not a formal legal opinion and may not be used by any person for the avoidance of Federal tax penalties.

---